

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Defendants.

:
 :
 :
 :
 : Civil Case No. 03-CV-3947 (FSH)
 :
 :
 : **OPINION AND ORDER**
 :
 :
 :
 : Date: July 6, 2005
 :
 :
 :
 :
 :

Plaintiff William Seymour Jones appeals the May 6, 2005 Order of Magistrate Judge Schwartz (1) granting Plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to discovery demands; (2) denying Plaintiff's request to compel Mr. Dermody to provide documents; and (3) denying Plaintiff's request to reconsider an April 27, 2005 decision denying Plaintiff's request to order Defendants to pay for and produce a copy of Plaintiff's deposition. Plaintiff appeals the portion of Magistrate Judge Schwartz's ruling that denies his requests for additional time and to compel Mr. Dermody to provide documents.

it appearing that Magistrate Judge Shwartz further determined that Defendants had diligently responded to Plaintiff's requests for discovery, and

it appearing that Magistrate Judge Shwartz further found that Plaintiff's discovery demands were moot, and

it appearing that the Order is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.¹

IT IS on this 6th day of July, 2005,

ORDERED that the May 6, 2005 decision by Magistrate Judge Shwartz, denying Plaintiff's discovery demands is **AFFIRMED**.

/s/ Faith S. Hochberg, U.S.D.J.

HON. FAITH S. HOCHBERG, U.S.D.J.

¹This Court reviews the May 6, 2005 Order under the clearly erroneous standard. A Magistrate's adjudication of a non-dispositive motion will be set aside only if the order is found to be clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Cipollone v. Liggett Group, Inc., 785 F.2d 1108, 1111, 1113 (3d Cir. 1986) cert. denied, 484 U.S. 976, 108, S. Ct. 487 (1987) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a); L. Civ. R. 72.1(c)).